

THE
"Plebs" Magazine

Vol. I.

October, 1909.

No. 9.

Copyright Entered at Stationer's Hall.

EDITORIAL

NOT only does the Central Labour College, which has just been established at Oxford, mark the beginning of a new epoch, in the educational sphere of the Labour Movement, for working men, but it opens the same vista for women. By the provision in its charter for the extension of educational facilities to women on the same basis as men, there is implied a conscious recognition of the equality of the sexes, as well as the unity of their interests. It would be strange if it were otherwise. No working-class institution or movement which hopes to realize its aspirations, can afford to shut out or ignore the working-class woman. She has to face the same problems as the working man. The real "Women's Movement" is not apart from, but a part of the wider Labour Movement. Those who attempt to separate them, who claim that the Woman question is a sex question and not a class question, are, however much they may repudiate the conclusion, logically following out the premise of the anti-feminist: that man by nature is one thing, and that woman by nature is an entirely different organization. Hence social difference results from natural difference, women are socially inferior because they are naturally inferior. This natural inferiority is held to be demonstrated both physically and mentally in the inferior physique, lower brain weight, and the absence of transcendent genius in woman. All of these arguments, if they can be dignified by that name, have been long since relegated to the lumber room of exploded fallacies. Human life is too short to warrant our recalling them, even if it be for the very laudable purpose of adding to the gaiety of nations. The point we wish to make is this: that while all "Votes for Women" organizations deny the social inferiority of their sex, some "Votes for Women" organizations, by making the question of women's social inequality to revolve around the difference of sex, practically admit the first premise of the anti-feminist school. Both start out from sexual differentiation,

THE greatest sufferers from social bondage are women. It is upon woman, especially the working-class woman, that the cross rests heaviest. Women are the most oppressed, the most exploited, the most impoverished. Relatively speaking there was

The Source of Social Slavery. hardly a time when a larger number of women found themselves in so unsatisfactory a condition as to-day. The industrial process, into which they are compelled to enter in ever increasing numbers, brings them directly under the economic lash of modern capitalism. They become numbered with the exploited wage-earner. Domestic subjection becomes merged in economic subjection. In this atmosphere "Questioning" finds its outcome in "Movement." The revolt of woman breaks out and begins to take on definite shape. "The right to vote" is added to "the right to work" and "the right to live." Generally speaking, all social movements in the early stages of their existence partake of a nebulous and promiscuous character. The Woman's Movement is no exception to the rule. Propertied and propertiless classes are found fighting together for what appears to be an object of the common good, until the different conditions under which these two different elements move, assert themselves and act as a touchstone, by which, action must be tested. To this touchstone previous methods and ideals no longer ring true. In the general unity there is revealed a contradiction which demands the inevitable cleavage. Where formerly one camp occupied the field there are now a number of camps each more or less in conflict with the other. The feminine movement takes upon itself the same characteristics as the masculine movement. Both reflect the same very definite economic relation in the present constitution of society, the relation of those who have exclusive ownership, or control, of the material means of producing, to those who are excluded or shut out. The relation is one of ever-growing antagonism. In a word it is the Class Struggle, from which alone the social slavery of both man and woman can be explained. Sex inequality is the product of economic inequality.

WE have said that women are the greatest sufferers from social bondage. They are also the longest sufferers. Woman was a slave before man was a slave. But not always, or everywhere, has she been in that degraded condition. Bachofen, Morgan,

**Historical
Development
of Woman.**

and other reliable investigators have shown that the paternal family which placed woman in a condition of subjection to man was preceded by the maternal family. The economic conditions under which matriarchal family institutions prevailed, were these: permanent domicile of the tribe; cultivation of the soil, and the manufacture of household utensils, almost exclusively by women; the practice of hunting by men; and the possibility of accumulating some property. Under such conditions woman was at least the peer of man, even exercising a superior influence in the affairs of the community. Hesiod says of the matriarchal family that when it

existed, man, even if he were a hundred years old, lived with his prudent mother—"he was fed in her house like a great child." Primitive religions, especially those prevalent in Egypt and Greece deified woman before man, which goes a long way to show that woman's intelligence was the first to develop. This transformation was the result of an economic process. The gradual extension of agriculture which woman had begun, rendered hunting more and more unnecessary. The improvement in the tools of production led to an increase in the quantity of manufactured things, which in turn resulted in exchange, first between tribes, and later between individuals within the tribe. With this development the support of the family became more and more the exclusive business of the males, while the women were limited to the narrower horizon of the household. With this limitation in the sphere of their activity, their value as producers of the necessaries of life decreased, and as a further result their influence in communal affairs waned. Economic development brought about the subjection of woman. Economic development is bringing about her emancipation. The emancipation of woman only becomes feasible when she is enabled to take part in social production, and when household duties require her attention in a minor degree. After long ages of continued oppression, economic conditions have become such as to make her again an economic factor in production. In the marvellous machinery and steam-power which the Industrial Revolution ushered in, is the sure and certain hope of social deliverance for woman as well as the working man. However painful may be the effects of this economic process, women will be compelled to think and act in the struggle, not against the "other sex" but against *the other class*, against the dominating wealth-owning few. Society is not divided along the line of sex, but along the line of ownership and non-ownership of the means of human life. The source of subjection is to be found neither in sex nor in sentimentalism, but in the social system. And wheresoever the source is, there also is to be found the solution.

THE class law and the class struggle exists in the world of the working woman as well as the working man, and just as dependence upon the owner of property is at the bottom of the labour question,

**Organization
and
Education.**

so it is also at the bottom of the woman question. With the growing exploitation of woman's labour, the complete dissimilarity of the problems and demands presented by the women of the working class and those of the capitalist class becomes more and more evident, and in the same degree the need for independent organization becomes more and more felt. But the mere knowledge that one is exploited is not enough to secure an intelligent organized revolt against the forces of exploitation. We beg to disagree with those who assert that when the stomach rubs against the backbone, the working man or woman

will commence to think. The sentiment that discontent alone is the moving factor of progress is unfortunately rather common. The mere knowledge of one's misery does not ensure the taking of correct action to remedy the defect. The mere painting in hideous colours of the condition of the working class in contrast to the luxury and leisure of the ruling class, of which we so often hear, is a form of mis-directed energy which is more likely to cause confusion than to create a conscious and intelligent uprising. Sound action is preceded by sound education. It is not enough to know that the present state of things hurts us, we must know the nature of this hurtful thing before we can apply the remedy. To know that we want something is not in itself sufficient. We must know what we want, and, what is more important still, how we are to get it, in other words we must first understand before we can transform. It is the brain that must guide our actions if they are to be good and beneficial, and not the stomach. Based upon that recognition—the recognition that organization and education are necessary partners—the "Plebs" League represents a necessary department in the working-class movement of both men and women. It is to supply what is the common and indispensable requirements of both sexes that the Central Labour College exists. The education of our working-class women is just as important as that of working-class men. It is mind that requires instruction irrespective of sex. To talk sneeringly as some of the high priests of anti-feminism do, about the "female mind" is quite as absurd as if they were to talk of the female liver. We are quite convinced that given the opportunity women are equally as capable of assimilating knowledge and applying it as men; and they need it just as much as men. Knowledge of things that concern her in the life of the factory, the shop, or the home, cannot possibly increase her misery, but it can do much to show the road to freedom and happiness. If the Woman's Movement is to succeed it must have recourse to the armoury of the intellect. The mere sentiment of indignation is not sufficient to free the working class: it must lay hold on the science of the century.

WE invite the workers in the Woman's Movement to consider this very important matter. For some years past there has been a steadily growing demand for an educational institution giving

**The Central
Labour College
and Women.**

facilities for woman students. The Central Labour College meets that demand. It offers a unique opportunity for providing an education which will be of inestimable service to the cause of the women. Very little difficulty should be experienced in providing the necessary residential equipment. A suitable hostel could be secured within easy reach of the College. And we feel certain that there are among the leaders of the Woman's Movement those who would take up the work of supervision and administration in a capable manner. What is the response?

Easy Outlines of Economic Science

No. 7—Manufacture to Machinufacture.

ERRATUM.—In last month's article, page 165, lines 14-15, the italicised words should be: *He buys in order to sell*. The difference is very important.—N. A.

MMARGINAL BILL.—You promised last time to show me the difference between profit and surplus value. I thought they were the same thing, but you Marxians are such sticklers for accurate definitions that I suppose you will be able to make or create some philosophical distinction.

Marxian Scientist.—You remember the old Biblical legend about the Tower of Babel? The deity, by creating a confusion in the language of the people, broke down a civilization. When one man asked for a bar the other man would hit him with a brick (at least that is what an American writer tells us). You will see from this the necessity of calling things by their proper names. That precaution I agree most Marxians are particular about. But I deny their anxiety to "create philosophical distinctions." The instance you refer to—the difference between profit and surplus value—will show whether or not it is academic nicety that Marxians strive for. The ordinary interpretation of the word profit may be illustrated by the following example: A capitalist invests £100 in industry. At the end of a year the £100 becomes £105. The capitalist then rightly concludes that he has made £5 or 5 per cent. profit. But a Marxian comes along and he asks: How was that £100 invested? He finds on investigation that £95 was spent in raw material and machinery and £5 in wages (a highly developed industry.) He then says to the capitalist: "The only commodity capable of creating value that you bought was the £5 worth of living labour power, as neither dead machinery nor raw material can create value. Originally you possessed £100 in value, and now you possess £105 in value. You therefore invested £5 in value-creating commodities and now possess a surplus value of £5, or 100 per cent surplus value; the net result of the whole transaction being that there is £5 in value more in the world than formerly." Now then, is that an academic nicety, or an important and profound distinction? Whereas the profit is only 5 per cent, the surplus value is 100 per cent. Is that merely a nicety of expression?

M. B.—That certainly is important and interesting, I only wish you were always as lucid and convincing. Now to your second promise. When and how did labour-power become a commodity?

M. S.—In England the process was something like this. Early in the 14th century, England was practically feudal. The people were engaged mainly in agriculture under feudal conditions, i.e. they had to

render so many days' labour to the feudal lord. In the villages and towns, production was on so small a scale and the guild regulations so binding, that no one was allowed to employ more than two or three apprentices. Wage labour was not dreamt of. Then arose the wool trade with the Netherlands. It was more profitable to grow sheep than men; hence during the next century the peasants and serfs were expropriated from the land and forced to crowd the towns. There they were, a large army of men with no property of any kind except the power locked up in their muscles and in their brains, (perhaps more in the former than the latter). Before these growing economic forces, the craft guild regulations crumbled to dust, and these expropriated workers sold their labour powers for wages, since when there has been, as your morning paper will tell you,—a labour market.

M. B.—But I thought you associated capitalism with industry on a large scale, and surely a better line of demarcation is what is known as the Industrial Revolution which took place at the end of the 18th century.

M. S.—Ah yes! that remark is characteristic of your school of thought. You take the dramatic periods in history and describe them as revolutions, which for you seem more to be a matter of dates than of principles. Capitalism commenced in the 16th century, not because of any invention of machinery but because of a different principle in the organization of production. Your works on the Industrial Revolution cover only from 1775, and are full of awe and wonder at the marvel of steam, comparable to that of a school child going for the first time to the sea-side.

M. B.—But surely you don't belittle the marvellous results of the application of steam to machinery?

M. S.—Certainly not, but I object to the undue emphasis given to a factor that after all was not the most important. A steam engine was constructed as early as the second century B.C. But it could not be applied until the division of labour had so revolutionized the mode of production as to make it practicable.

M. B.—What do you mean? The division of labour made the application of steam possible! Explain yourself.

M. S.—The application of steam to machinery becomes possible only when industry has passed from the old communism to handicraft, and then to manufacture. The handicraft stage of production contains elements of great permanence and prevails largely in Asia to-day. But when conditions such as I have just related to you which create a great army of wage labour appear, it breaks down and gives way to manufacture. Here all the separate handicraftsmen are united in one shop for the production of a whole commodity, as in the case of a union of the separate handicraftsmen whose combined labour makes a carriage; or by the co-operation of a number of

artificers in one shop, at first engaged in the production of, say, a needle, and that developing into each separate process being exclusively performed by one individual, which gradually ossifies into a systematic division of labour. Manufacture soon revolutionizes the tools of production when there is a growing army of wage labourers constantly impelling it on. As Darwin points out—"knives that are adapted to cut all sorts of things may on the whole be of one shape; but an implement destined to be used exclusively in one way must have a different shape for every different use." When this process goes on for a lengthy period, by the different shape of the instruments, production becomes so uniform that a simple combination of the tools makes a machine. Then the application of steam is possible and for the first time economical. The division of labour has the effect of cheapening the commodity. There is no argument so powerful as cheapness for causing social development. Once introduced it grows ever more rapidly, shattering every prejudice however ancient that stands in its way; it is the "battering ram which breaks down Chinese walls" and forces a world market. Manufacture then soon leads to machinofacture which is impossible without it. As Lassalle says: "For how could production by means of machinery be possible under the system of guilds, by which the number of men and apprentices which a master might keep was fixed by law in every locality? Again under this system of Guilds the different branches of an industry were marked off from one another in the most exact manner by law . . . so that . . . for hundreds of years the tailors who made clothes were engaged in lawsuits with the tailors who mended them, the makers of nails with the locksmiths, in order to fix the limits which separated their trades A stage had thus been reached at which production itself . . . had brought into existence . . . instruments of production . . . which would find no place or room for development in that system." You will see, my friend, even from this rough outline the relative importance of the changes vast and fundamental which preceded the Industrial Revolution.

M. B.—You have at least aroused my interest, and I shall investigate the matter more closely; but while you were speaking a thought arose in my mind which I have many times wanted to put to you, namely, that the development of machinery is not uniform or spontaneous, and therefore the proportion between the number of workers employed in one industry at different stages of development must vary. If that be so, then as labour, according to you, alone creates value, then there must be different values produced in the same industry, whereas we know that on the market there is only one price. Hence it seems to me that all commodities cannot be sold at their values, which is surely a contradiction of the whole Marxian theory!

M. S.—The point you now raise is quite irrelevant to what we have been discussing, and I cannot go into the matter now. If you will raise the point later I will show you, that far from being a contradiction, it is a point that excellently displays the evolutionary character of Marxian economics, in harmony with the evolutionary character of industry. But first of all we must understand the division of labour among capitalists themselves, and must know a little more of the process of circulation. It is too late to commence that now, so I'll wish you good night!

Next Month :—

"A Criticism of J. R. Macdonald's *Socialism and Society*."

NOAH ABLETT.

The Study of Sociology

(Continued.)

MAN'S relations in society are the outcome of what has gone before, the fruit of historical conditions. Only by bearing this in mind can we understand existing institutions, learn how codes of morality come to be formulated and determine what course of action makes for the common good. This method is that of historical materialism, the Socialist interpretation of history. That the method is a rational one is shown by the fact that the establishment of international commercial connexions is followed by the holding of international conferences on matters of diplomatic, philosophical, scientific and sociological nature, although some of these conferences are international in little but name. It is shown in the fact that the so-called "individualistic" school of sociology, represented by Spencer, which was a reflex of capitalism in its younger days, is being ousted by the modern "social" school, indicating that our social order is drawing to a close.

It is in the domain of criminal sociology, of all special fields, that possibly the most satisfactory work has been done thus far. For this we are indebted particularly to Enrico Ferri, of the positive school of criminology of Lombroso.

Distinguishing three causes of crime—heredity, physical, and social environments—Ferri divides criminals into five groups: criminal madmen, born criminals, criminals by contracted habits, occasional criminals, and criminals of passion, and declares that mad criminals and criminals of passion are 5 to 10 per cent. of the total; born and habitual criminals, 40 to 50 per cent. and occasional criminals, 40 to 50 per cent. While laying due stress upon this fact, Ferri goes on to say, "It is to the social factors that we must chiefly attribute the periodic variations of criminality." Again, "The truth is that the balance of crime is determined by the

physical and social environment. But by changing the condition of the social environment, which is most easily modified, the legislator may alter the influence of the telluric environment and the organic and psychic conditions of the population, control the greater portion of crimes and reduce them considerably." His studies lead him to formulate a "law of criminal saturation," which he explains as follows: "Just as in a given volume of water, at a given temperature, we find a solution of a fixed quantity of any chemical substance, not an atom more or less, so in a given social environment, in certain defined physical conditions of the individual, we find the commission of a fixed number of crimes." It is in obedience to this law that at one time men try to break out of jail, while at another time they try to break in.

The positive school, therefore, considers the criminal a victim rather than a free will agent. It proceeds upon the theory that, as the saying goes, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and, in its programme, offers "penal substitutes," whereby criminal proclivities may be diverted into non-criminal and useful channels. It may be said, however, that the carrying out of this programme is largely dependent upon the progress of the workers and the birth of a social consciousness. In the minor courts to-day, to the greatest degree, and to some extent in the superior courts, judges are chosen, not so much for being learned in the law as for wealth or service to the political machine. It goes without saying that this is equally true of legislators and prison officials. Also, the "law of criminal saturation" is quite acceptable to one who regards society from the standpoint of historical materialism. The theory of saturation may be applied to other social ills; it is but another way of putting it that the human race tolerates one social order until it is ready for another.

In some respects the most courageous work done in the field of sociology is that of the school of Ratzenhofer, represented by Albion W. Small. Says the latter, in his work on *General Sociology*: "In the beginning were interests. . . . The primary interests of every man, as of every animal, is in sheer keeping alive. . . . The conspicuous element in the history of the race, so far as it has been recorded, is universal conflict of interests." The last sentiment is readily recognized as the opening thought of the "Communist Manifesto," Engels footnote included. Small lays stress upon class interests, dividing society into "three chief groups: the privileged; the middle class; those without property, rights, or influence."

This is a pretty good working foundation. Furthermore, if sociology is, as its exponents affirm, the science of sciences, the bouquet of the others, it must take a stand in this great conflict of contending interests. Sociology that exists for its own sake is sterile. There is no sociology for the sake of sociology, as Ferri well puts it. It must exist for the sake of society. Just as there is a positive

school of criminal sociology, so there must be a positive programme for general sociology. Small perceives this. So he declares: "From the human standpoint no science is an end in itself. The proximate end of all science is organization into action." And again, "The sociologists believe that the most worthy work of men is effort to improve human conditions." Following this theme, Small talks in the language of the Socialist: "Civilization involves approach to a situation in which each person shall be a person, not a commodity for other persons; in which also each person shall be equally free with every other person to develop the type of personality latent in his natural endowment, not the sort of personality to which he would be limited by arbitrary division of opportunity." Small accepts Socialist economics: "In the first place, capital itself produces nothing. It earns nothing. This is contrary to general economic presumption." And following this: "If we are justified in drawing any general conclusions whatever from human experience thus far, it is safe to say that the social process tends to put an increasing proportion of individuals in possession of all the goods which have been discovered by the experience of humanity as a whole, and that all social programmes should be thought out with a view to promotion of this tendency."

How near Small comes to the Socialist position may be gathered from this thought, which is repeated throughout his work: "The great value of sociology to most people will be an indirect consequence of its furnishing a point of view, a perspective, an atmosphere, which will help to place all the problems of life with which each has to deal; or, to use a different figure, it will serve as a pass-key to all the theoretical difficulties about society that each of us may encounter." What is the nature of this pass-key? "Indeed, we have come to realize that politics at bottom is very largely manoeuvring to control the means of controlling wealth." Here Small uses historical materialism as a pass-key.

But because Small does not accept in full the position of the Socialist, his work has no positive programme. And such a programme it must have, to be worth anything. For, in his own words, "If our sociology turns out to be real knowledge, not the temporary aberration of a few pedants, it must have a message that can be translated from technical academic phraseology into the thought and words of common life." Small could not strike off better the charge of the Socialist; he could not better acknowledge the challenge of the workers that the fulfilling of this purpose is the express mission of the Socialist movement.

It is just the theory of historical materialism that is the vitalizing force of sociology. If "history is sociology in the yoke," as Small contends, and if sociology is largely a matter of interpretation, as he believes, he must accept historical materialism or offer a substitute. "History is just becoming rational, just beginning to ascertain its

function and to comprehend its rightful domain. History—not that fragment we now call history, but the record and contemplation of the evolution of things—the history of social conditions and tendencies, of theories and experiments, of laws and institutions, in times gone by—that wider history which narrates events antedating human memory and consciousness—the history of the long processes in the evolution of life on this planet—history which tells of the mighty, unseen cataclysms which took place in the fiery eons of the earth's babyhood—the biography of planets and systems and of the peoples and institutions that have evolved upon them—this is history in its future rational and universal sense." Such is the utterance of J. Howard Moore, in his "*Better World Philosophy*." Is it a mere accident that this new attitude toward history comes after Marx formulated the theory of historical materialism, showing that the rise of the Labour Movement would necessitate just such an attitude?

And is it an accident that the end of sociology is said to be the socialization of achievement, just at the time when the workers declare their programme to be the socialization of industry? That it is no accident, we may gather from the fact that Ward accepts the Socialist position on this matter, as well as historical materialism, even though he calls himself a "sociocrat" instead of Socialist.

Let us put together what Wards tells us. "National freedom and political freedom have been achieved. Social freedom remains to be achieved." "The movement that is now agitating society is different from any of the previous movements, but it differs from them only as they differ from one another. It is nothing less than the coming to consciousness of the proletariat." "For the first time in the history of political parties there has been formed a distinctively industrial party, which possesses all the elements of permanence and may soon be a controlling factor in American politics. Though this may not as yet presage a great social revolution, still it is precisely the way in which a reform in the direction indicated should be expected to originate." "There is only one live problem, the maximum equalization of intelligence." "The union, association and complete fusion of all races into one great homogeneous race—the race of man—is the final step in social evolution." "Mankind wants no eleemosynary schemes, no private nor public benefactions, no fatherly oversight of the privileged classes, nor any other form of patronizing hypocrisy. They only want power—the power which is their right and which lies within their grasp. They have only to reach out and take it. The victims of privative ethics are in the immense majority. They constitute society. They are the heirs of all the ages. They have only to rouse and enter upon their patrimony that the genius of all lands and of all time has generously bequeathed to them."

And Morgan, too, accepts the Socialist position, when he says: "When the intelligence of mankind rises to the height of the great question of the abstract rights of property,—including the relations

of property to the state, as well as the rights of persons to property,—a modification of the present order of things may be expected. The nature of the coming changes it may be impossible to conceive; but it seems probable that democracy, once universal in a rudimentary form and repressed in many civilized states, is destined to become again universal and supreme."

The sociology that responds to every test, therefore, is Socialist sociology. It furnishes the pass-key to understand the society of the past and to explain its present structure. It rests upon the theory that material interests are of fundamental importance and that they must be satisfactorily adjusted before there can be peace among mankind. It recognizes that so long as one man anywhere is enslaved, the human race is enslaved. It points to the war of the classes and declares that the future of the working class is the future of society. It brings sociology down to earth and the common man, where it belongs. Its programme is the life-giving force to sociology: to socialize achievement by converting the means of production into collective property, thereby making the fullest and freest development of the individual accord with the welfare and progress of society, and replacing the existing chaos and conflict by harmony and happiness.

JOSEPH E. COHEN.

Evolution of Society

THE greatest question before mankind at the present time is how to solve the social problem. For many years past this question has been the "bone of contention" both inside and outside of our great centres of learning. Many of the theories advanced have been of a superficial nature, and consequently of no real value. They have fallen to the ground upon the application of modern scientific thought. Science must be our "Moses" in this, as in all other problems. It alone can lead us out of the present chaos. This is the supreme duty of science; otherwise it has no meaning for humanity. The generalizations made in the past by scientific men have enabled them to establish the theory of development, apart from which every explanation must be ruled out of order. The progress of society, or its transmission from one stage to another, can only be explained from this point of view. Keeping this theory in mind, and abandoning all others, we shall achieve far better results in considering the above question. The Evolution of Society points to the abolition of capitalism, which will only take place in proportion as collectivism is ushered in. In looking at the history of the human race one is greatly impressed by the perpetual changes which take place in its institutions. We see new ones taking the place of the

old. Strong, vigorous structures seem to push their way into being, whilst the old ones, having ceased to serve their functions, are eliminated. The principle which has been rightly designated "the struggle for structure" must be observed in the study of modern society. No one can conceive of the structure called capitalism being eliminated without some other one taking its place, and conversely, no one can conceive of collectivism coming into existence without capitalism being eliminated. Both cannot live at the same time. One must go to the wall in the struggle for structure. Collectivism is the next stage of development in society. Evolution from feudalism to capitalism was unconscious; from the latter to collectivism will be conscious. It will not be left severely alone to economic laws. We must create a new structure, leaving the old one severely alone. It is only on this principle that we get any progress. Socialist agitators, it may be remarked, should observe this principle when in the habit of attacking the other reform movements of this country. The above principle is in direct agreement with the law of continuity, and therefore quite contrary to the ideas formulated by Utopians. These people seem to imagine that society will take one clear jump into an eldorado, such as is pictured by the poet's imagination. They violate the principle of continuity, and are consequently without any rational theory of progress. The elaborate utopias pictured by the Socialists of France and Germany in the seventeenth century were of no real value to society when looked at from a practical point of view.

It is impossible to apply the ethics of the seventeenth century to society in the twentieth century without coming to grief. Consideration must be taken of the morality of the people in its relation to the material surroundings. The elements of collectivism exist to-day, and a thorough knowledge of these must be obtained before we can form any adequate conception of the complete system. As already remarked, we cannot think of collectivism apart from the present system. To show what is characteristic of all systems let us repeat the words of Herbert Spencer, viz. "the present is the child of the past and the parent of the future." This brilliant metaphor applies equally to collectivism, which is the child of capitalism. The child, however, is only in the embryonic stage. What is essential to note here is that the present system of society tends, in its development, towards Socialism. Ample exemplification of this truth is found in trusts. Here we see the actual operation of a collectivist principle. Trusts are the natural outcome of increased competition. Competition, a century ago, was the capitalists' god, now, however, it is their greatest enemy.

But, in order to avoid the destructive tendencies of free competition, they have applied a collectivist principle to industry, i.e. combination, or, the formation of trusts. Now competition

emanates from the capitalist system of production, and we see, therefore, how the system itself is gradually paving the way for the new order. Collectivism has many principles, and one of the most important is the minimum expenditure of energy. The trust presents us with a concrete example of how to do it. Not only in industry do we find tendencies towards collectivism. No one has failed to notice the development of the social sensorium. We cannot fail to have realized the closer relation between society and the individual. On the Continent we have nationalization of railways, and here in England we have the post office; besides the numerous municipal undertakings scattered throughout the land. To these may be added our national system of education and the feeding of school children. All these express the tendency of the State to look after the individual. Moreover, the greater the tendency in this direction the nearer we are brought to collectivism. It must not, however, be assumed that from what has already been stated that collectivism will come through economic laws alone. A more erroneous conclusion could not be drawn. In its very essence it would be ignoring the fact that society is composed of intelligent human beings. Intelligence must play a prominent part in the work. But, this involves the question of what nature should the intelligence be? These questions must be faced and answered.

We must have a system of education which will enable us to understand the laws underlying human society. In a word, nothing short of a general scientific education will suffice. It is not claimed that each individual should have a detailed knowledge of all the sciences, but that every one should have a knowledge of their main principles. Having done this the next step would be to understand the relationship between all the sciences. To bring about this result it is not necessary to wait for new scientific discoveries. There is enough knowledge in existence to make the world a perfect paradise. But only a few have the knowledge, and the people generally know nothing of its existence. Our first duty, then, is to bring about a more equal distribution of the knowledge now extant. But, it may be argued, the condition of the masses is by no means conducive to the requirement of knowledge. This may be true to a certain extent. Still the conditions of the people can only be bettered through a knowledge of social forces. Men can only form opinions from what they know. If the masses, therefore, were given access to this knowledge the end would be only a matter of time. The economic pressure of to-day forces the individual to seek better conditions. It is here that intelligence steps in and shows him the way. It enables him to see the great advantages brought about by socializing the means of life.

W. J. EDWARDS, Aberdare.

The "Plebs" Meet

(Continued from September Number)

AFTER the Secretary's Report had been adopted the next item dealt with was the policy of the magazine. The following resolution was carried unanimously, viz :

That this meeting endorses the general policy of the magazine as outlined in the published numbers.

The financial position was then considered. The total income to the end of July was £62 6s. 11½d; expenditure £63 1s. 2d; with liabilities a few pounds above assets. This was held to be very satisfactory, considering the heavy expenses which had been forced upon the League by the peculiar situation which had arisen at Ruskin College owing to the enforced resignation of Mr. Hird; and the necessity of altering the whole policy of the League in regard to that institution. It was decided to consider the best means of meeting the deficit on Tuesday morning.

The election of Officers was then proceeded with. George Sims was unanimously elected Editor, and General Secretary-Treasurer. It was decided that the Executive Committee should be five in number. Nominations were then taken, the following being the result of the voting :

W. W. Craik	...	63	J. H. H. Ballantyne	...	46
W. G. E. Pratley	...	60	F. Hodges	...	37
E. Gill	...	57	T. Rees	...	19
N. Ablett	...	46	F. Burgess	...	17

The first five were declared elected. (At Tuesday's meeting N. Ablett resigned, and C. Watkins was elected in his stead). Two Auditors were elected, T. Rees and B. Ames.

The other item dealt with on Monday afternoon was the election of three representatives to the Provisional Committee of Central Labour College. Nominations were taken, and the voting upon these were as follows :—

N. Ablett	...	58	T. J. Keating	...	30
Mrs. Bridges Adams	...	56	T. Evans	...	17
Edward Gill	...	34	C. Pattinson	...	13
F. Burgess	...	32	W. L. Cook	...	7

The meeting was then adjourned till Tuesday morning.

At the adjourned meeting the question of organization was fully discussed, and it was decided to elect organizers for the purpose of more efficiently carrying on the work of the League. The list of those elected will be found on the back page of magazine cover. The following resolution was then passed, viz :

That the local organizations be founded, connected with the central body, for the purpose of furthering the objects of the League, viz: the establishment of Labour Colleges; the increase of the circulation of the magazine; and the formation of classes for the study of social science.

Owing to our own financial difficulties, which would be a heavy strain on our members, it was decided to take no steps at present to give financial support to Central Labour College as a League. A resolution was moved as follows :

That we recommend to the Provisional Committee the sending out of an appeal to branches of Labour organizations to subscribe a penny voluntary levy in support of Central Labour College.

In the event of this being done we call upon all members of the League to support the proposal in their various organizations.

The consideration of the issuing of a pamphlet on the general movement, and the best means of meeting the financial difficulties of the League were left to the Executive Committee.

It was decided that the Editor should ascertain through the magazine what increased support could be guaranteed to justify the reduction of the price of the magazine to one penny. Should the result be satisfactory the Editor to be empowered to issue future numbers at the price mentioned.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman concluded the Meeting.



If you do not hear Reason she will rap you over the knuckles.—
Franklin.

What's in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet.—*Shakespeare.*

Man shall be trained for war, and woman for the recreation of the warrior; all else is folly.—*Friedrich Nietzsche.*

Signs of high breeding in men generally, will be kindness and mercifulness, these always indicating more or less fineness of make in the mind.—*Ruskin.*

Special Notices to Members.

PAMPHLET.

The Second Edition of pamphlet *The Burning Question of Education* is now ready. It contains views of Central Labour College. It will be sent Post free 1½d., 10d. a dozen, carriage paid. Special Terms to Labour organizations. Push the sale!

LEVY.

The response to appeal is not very satisfactory up to the present. Please send along your shilling as early as possible.

MAGAZINE.

In response to the request of the members present at Meet we should be glad to hear from members whether they would be prepared to guarantee to take a definite number of magazines in excess of their present order were the price reduced to a *penny*.

ORGANIZERS.

Get into touch with the organizers in your district and see what collective action can be taken in the interests of the League.

CENTRAL LABOUR COLLEGE.

We are asked to announce that gifts of Books on Social Science, &c. will be gratefully accepted and acknowledged by Librarian, C. L. C. Oxford.

The Logic of "Direct Labour Representation"

THE argument for "direct labour representation" has been stated over and over again by certain apologists with such assumed satisfaction as to preclude for ever anything further in the shape of question or controversy. It has been, and still is, assumed that the last word has been said on what, after all, is still a controversial subject, among reformers. It is ever believed that nothing further can be said that will, in any way, weaken the position taken up. Not so the present writer. He believes that much of what has been said and written is illogical and incongruous; and while not in the least hostile to the principle of "direct labour representation," properly understood and consistent with itself, yet feels that certain anomalies and incongruities need to be pointed out. But such criticism need not be resented with fear as to results. As one writer has recently said on another subject: "It is only unsound flesh that must not be touched. The upright man welcomes even unfriendly inquiry; whilst the party that cries out when its doings are looked into is deservedly mistrusted; it is either full of childish caprice or guilty fear." It is the easiest thing in the world for reformers like the redoubtable Crooks (I had almost written infallible, though one has no wish to apotheosize him here) to sneer and jibe across the floor of the House of Commons at those other reformers, Labour representatives who do not happen to share the particular views on labour representation as he; and to strut about like a Tory lord, saying: "We are the Labour Party," and much more to the same effect. I have read, somewhere, of a certain old time people who were very fond of shouting the praises of their national god. It seems to me that the Labour Party has been pedestalled by its devotees, for they are never tired of shouting: "Great is our Diana!" But thinking man wants logic and not so much parade and bombast. So the first thing to do in an examination of this subject is to get right down to fundamentals. Let us see at the outset what is meant by "direct labour representation." In order that there shall be no equivocation or ambiguity about the terms, let us see what they stand for and connote. Do we mean by the phrase, (1) representation of a Constituency having a preponderance, or a totality even, of the "labouring classes," using the phrase in its narrowest sense? If we use the phrase in its broadest sense where shall we stop? Who is to represent such "labourers" as, e.g. Lord Avebury, Lord Brassey, Prof. Marshall, and Prof. Darwin, &c.? (We cannot have it both ways, I think); or (2) "direct" in the sense of having a "working man" as a representative? (Here again I suppose, the term "working man" must be narrowed); or, (3) in the sense

of having a representative—whether of one's own "class" or not—supported entirely by working-class funds?

All will agree, I think, that it must mean one of the above definitions. If the definition in the first category be the correct one, what about those industrial constituencies with diverse representation? For example. Who represents Preston in Parliament? J. T. Macpherson, who is a rampant Socialist; or Harold Cox, just as rampant an individualist? Who represents Blackburn? Phillip Snowden or Sir Harry Hornby? or West Ham? Will Thorne or Charles Masterman? or Stockport? George Wardle or Sir James Duckworth? or Glasgow? George Barnes, or Scott Dickens? and so on, *ad infinitum*.

Turn now to the Agriculture Constituencies. Who represents the agriculture labourer in Parliament? Some constituencies have Tory representation, others have Liberal, none have "Labour." Some have labouring men as representatives though, i.e. George Nicholls and James Rowlands, to mention two only. Are these men not bona-fide "labour representatives? Considering this aspect a little more closely, what about the representation of Oldham, for instance? at present there are two Liberals. Do they represent the working people of this large industrial constituency? They were elected by the working people anyway. Yet in 1900 these same electors chose a Liberal and a Tory; and in 1899 two Liberals; and in 1895 two Tories. The same applies to Colne Valley. Does Victor Grayson represent his constituency? If so, then surely it is logical to hold that Sir James Kitson did when he was elected two years previously! And supposing Grayson to be defeated at the next election, will not his successor as truly represent his constituency?

But then, this opens up a wider question. What about the "Labour" Party in Parliament, which claims to represent alone the labouring classes? If that party is halved, for example. at the next general election, will the labouring classes be any less represented? If so then the logical deduction is that before the advent of the "Labour" Party, the labouring classes had no voice nor representation in Parliament, which is absurd! We may as well wipe out history.

This conclusion necessarily leads to the second question. If we mean by "direct labour representation" having a working man as representative, what becomes of the argument against labour representation outside the "Labour" Party, i.e. Liberal-Labour representation? What about the much-maligned trio, Maddison, Vivian and Bell? and the rest of their colleagues who happen to have been returned as Liberal nominees? If the representative is a genuine "working man" and is chosen by his fellow-men to represent them, who is to say he does not? And who is to say that when he speaks, as he believes, on their behalf, that he has no right to speak "for

labour"? forsooth! If this argument holds good in a particular case then it holds good throughout; and so, if Mr. John Ward does not represent Stoke, or "Labour," though I think he is paid by the Nавvies' Union, then the Miners' representatives (outside the "Labour Party") do not represent their constituents, who are mainly miners, though they are paid, I think, by their respective Unions. I suppose that now they have decided to affiliate with the "Labour" Party, they will be fully entitled to speak for "Labour"? But why not before? They are the pick of their fellows and constitutionally and democratically elected by them. Strange logic that which will by the simple turn of a vote make a man competent to represent those same constituents whom, previously, outsiders decreed he could not and did not! Strange, indeed! By what process of reasoning can Stephen Walsh be deemed fit to represent the miners of Ince and Herbert Samuel unfit to represent the miners of Cleveland?

But let us proceed to the next point, viz. does "direct labour representation" mean representation by one who has the knowledge of the conditions, and, therefore, the requirements of the labouring classes, but wholly supported by working-class funds? If this is what it means, then no one has a more "direct" right to represent "labour" than John Ward, Richard Bell and the miners' representatives who are paid. I suppose Mr. Bernard Shaw, Mr. Allan, of Glasgow, the Hon. Charles Lister, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, to mention but a few of the middle and upper classes, would be competent persons to represent "labour" if elected as nominees of the Labour Party! But why not Sidney Webb, Charles Booth, Seebohm Rowntree, &c. &c.? Does a mere subscription to a formula, or the adoption by a party, make a man competent when otherwise he would not be? It cannot be because of a difference in "class"; that would shut out Shaw, Allan, Lister, Campbell and the rest. It cannot be because they are "capitalists." That would shut out others like the present "Labour" candidate for Reading. But what shall I more say? This: will some one be good enough to tell me what is really meant by the specious phrase representing the subject of this article?

In concluding, let me here anticipate what, I think, will be urged against me. I have reason to believe it will be said by some that I have been inspired to write as above by a particular animus. May I give a most emphatic disclaimer to that. I have no animus whatever against the Labour Party except in so far as its constitution and its pretensions are illogical and arrogant. As I said at the beginning I am in favour of direct labour representation when it can really and truly be secured. All I now say is that we have not got such representation in the "Labour Party" any more than we have it in some members who are outside that party.

J. S. WHITEHEAD.

THE GOLD SICKLE,

OR

Hena, the Virgin of the Isle of Sen

A TALE OF DRUID GAUL

BY EUGENE SUE,

Translated from the Original French by DANIEL DE LEON.

CHAPTER VI.—*Continued.*

“**T**HE Gallic army awaited Cæsar on the left bank of the river. Three times did the Roman army cross, and three times was it compelled to recross it, fighting up to their waists in the blood-reddened waters. The Roman is overthrown, the oldest legions are shattered. Cæsar alights from his horse, swings his sword, rallies his last cohorts of veterans, that were already yielding ground, and at their head charges upon our army. Despite Cæsar’s courage the battle was lost to him, when we saw a fresh body arrive to his aid.”

“You say, ‘We saw?’” asked Joel. “Were you at that terrible battle?”

But the unknown visitor proceeded without answering: “Exhausted, decimated by a severe seven hours’ fight, we still held out against the fresh troops . . . we fought to the bitter end . . . we fought unto death . . . And do you know,” added the stranger with an expression of profound grief, “do you know, you who remained peacefully at home, while your brothers were dying for the liberty of Gaul, which is also yours,—do you know how many survived of the sixty thousand men in the Gallic army—in that battle of the Sambre? . . . *Not five hundred!*”

“Not five hundred!” cried Joel as if questioning the figures.

“I say so because I am one of the survivors”, answered the stranger proudly.

“Then the two fresh scars on your face—”

“I received them at the battle of the Sambre—”

CHAPTER VII.—“WAR! WAR! WAR!”

A furious barking of dogs in the yard and a distinct noise of hard rapping at the gate of the balustrade interrupted the stranger’s narrative. Still labouring under the painful impression of the traveller’s words, the family of the brenn for a moment imagined their homestead was being attacked. The women rose precipitately, the little ones rushed to their mothers’ arms, the men ran for their

arms that hung from the wall. But the dogs soon ceased barking, although the rapping at the gate continued unabated. Joel said to his family :

"Although they are still rapping, the dogs do not bark. They must know who is at the gate."

Saying this, the brenn stepped out. Several of his kinsmen, the stranger included, followed him out of prudence. The yard gate was opened and two voices were heard outside the palisades crying :

"It is we, friends, . . . Albinik and Mikael."

Indeed the two sons of the brenn were distinguished by the light of the torches, and behind them their horses, panting for breath and white with foam. After tenderly embracing his sons, especially the mariner, who was absent over a year on his sea journeys, Joel entered the house with them, where they were received with joy and not a little surprise by their mother and other relatives.

Albinik the mariner and Mikael the armourer were, like their father and their brother, men of large and robust stature. Over their clothes they carried a caped cloak of heavy woollen fabric streaming with the rain. Upon entering the house, and even before embracing their mother, the new arrivals stepped to the altar and approached their lips to the seven small twigs of mistletoe that stood dipped in the copper bowl on the large stone. They there noticed a lifeless body covered with oak branches, near which Julyan still sat.

"Good evening, Julyan," said Mikael. "Who is dead?"

"It is Armel; I killed him this evening in a sword contest," answered Julyan; "but as we have both pledged brotherhood to each other, I shall join him to-morrow beyond. If you wish it I shall mention you to him."

"Yes, yes, Julyan; I loved Armel and expected to find him alive. In the bag on my horse I have a little harpoon head of iron that I forged for him; I shall place it to-morrow on the pyre of you two—"

"And you must tell Armel," added the mariner smiling, "that he went away too soon; his friends Albinik and Meroë would have told him their last experience at sea."

"It is Armel and myself," replied Julyan with a smile, "who will have pretty stories to tell you. Your sea trips will be like nothing to the travels that await us in those marvellous worlds that none has seen and all will see."

After Margarid's two sons had answered the tender inquiries of their mother and family, the brenn said to the unknown traveller :

"Friend, these are my two sons."

"May it please heaven that the suddenness of their arrival may not be caused by some evil event," answered the traveller.

"I say so, too, my children," rejoined Joel. "What has happened that you come at so late an hour and in such hurry? Happy be your return, Albinik, but I did not expect it so soon. But where is the gentle Meroë?"

"I left her at Vannes, father. This is what has happened. I returned from Spain by the Gulf of Gascony on the way to England. The bad weather forced us to put in at Vannes. But by Teutates, who presides over all journeys by land and sea, here on earth and beyond, I did not expect—no, I did not expect to see what I saw in that town. I, therefore, left my vessel in port in charge of my sailors with my wife as their chief. I took a horse and galloped to Auray. There I gave the news to Mikael, and we hastened hither to forewarn you, father."

"And what is it you saw at Vannes?"

"What did I see? All the inhabitants, in revolt, full of indignation and rage, like the brave Bretons that they are!"

"And what is the reason of it all, children?" asked Mamm' Margarid without leaving her distaff.

"Four Roman officers without any other escort than four soldiers and as calmly insolent as if they were in some enslaved country, came in yesterday and commanded the magistrates of the town to issue orders to all the neighbouring tribes to send to Vannes ten thousand bags of wheat—"

"And what else?" asked Joel laughing and shrugging his shoulders.

"Five thousand bags of oats."

"And what else?"

"Five hundred barrels of hydromel."

"Of course," said the brenn laughing louder, "they must also drink—and what else?"

"A thousand heads of beef."

"And, of course, the fattest—What else?"

"Five thousand sheep."

"That's right. One soon gets tired of beef only. Is that all, my boy?"

"They also demanded three hundred horses to furnish new equipages to the Roman cavalry, besides two hundred wagons of forage."

"And why not? The poor horses must be fed," continued Joel sneeringly. "But there must be some more orders. If they begin to issue orders, why stop at all?"

"The provisons were to be taken in wagons as far as Poitou and Touraine."

"And what is the wide maw that is to swallow up those bags of wheat, those sheep, those heads of beef and barrels of hydromel?"

"Above all," added the traveller, "who is to pay for all those provisions?"

"Pay for them!" replied Albinik. "Why, nobody. It is a forced impost."

"Ha! Ha!" laughed Joel.

"And the wide maw that is to gulp up the provisions is none other than the Roman army, which is wintering in Touraine and Anjou."

A shudder of rage mixed with disdain ran through the family of the brenn. "Well, Joel," the unknown traveller remarked, "do you still think that it is a long way from Touraine to Brittany? The distance does not seem to me long, seeing that the officers of Cæsar come calmly and without escort, empty-pursed and swinging high their canes, to provision their army here."

Joel no longer laughed; he dropped his head and remained silent.

"Our guest is right," put in Albinik; "these Romans came empty-pursed and swinging high their canes. One of them even raised his cane over old Ronan, the oldest magistrate of Vannes, who, like you, father, objected strongly to the Roman exaction."

"And yet, children, what else can we do but laugh at these demands: To levy these provisionings upon us and the neighboring tribes of Vannes; to force us to carry the requisitions to Touraine and Anjou with our oxen and horses which the Romans will surely keep also, and all that at the very season of the late sowing and of our autumn labours; to ruin next year's harvest;—why, that is to reduce us to living upon the grass that would have fed the cattle that they rob us of!"

"Yes," said Mikael the armourer; "they want to take away our wheat and our cattle, and leave the grass. By the iron of the lance that I was forging this very morning, it shall be the Romans who, under our blows, will bite the grass on our fields!"

"Vannes is now preparing to defend herself if attacked," added the mariner. "They have begun to throw up trenches in the neighbourhood of the port. All our sailors are to be armed, and if the Roman galleys attack us by sea, never will the sea crows have had a like feast of corpses upon our beach."

"While crossing to-night the other tribes," resumed Mikael, "we spread the news and sounded the alarm. The magistrates of Vannes have also sent out messengers in all directions ordering that fires be lighted from hill to hill, and thereby give immediate notice of the imminent danger from one end of Brittany to the other."

Without once dropping her distaff, Mamm' Margarid had listened to the report given by her sons. When they stopped speaking she calmly said:

"As to those Roman officers, my sons, were they not sent back to their army—after a thorough caning?"

(To be continued.)